DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 895 EC 300 627

AUTHOR Landers, Mary F.; Weaver, Roberta
TITLE Teaching Competencies Identified by Mainstream Teachers: Implications for Teacher Training.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children (69th, Atlanta, GA, April 1-5, 1991). The research was supported by a grant provided by the State of Ohio's State Superintendent's Task Force on Preparing Special Education Personnel.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Competence; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Mainstreaming; Preservice Teacher Education; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education Teachers; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This survey of 204 regular classroom teachers sought to determine to what extent 65 competencies (identified as essential for special education teachers of the severely handicapped) are necessary for teachers who have special education students mainstreamed into their classrooms. The mainstream teacher sample in this study and a special education teacher sample from a 1987 study both valued the 65 core competencies similarly. Competencies perceived by mainstream teachers as important were also perceived to be possessed to some degree. Thirty-two competencies were rated as important enough to suggest placement within a preservice teacher education program. The strong correlation between inservice special educator ratings and inservice mainstream teacher ratings on the importance of the core competencies suggests a shared "subcore" of competencies which has the potential for bringing the mainstream teacher and the special educator together for collaboration. Preservice and inservice program implications are listed. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TEACHING COMPETENCIES IDENTIFIED BY MAINSTREAM TEACHERS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER TRAINING

ED336895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A paper presented by

Mary F. Landers
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio

and

Roberta Weaver
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio

at the
Council for Execptional Children,
69TH Annual Convention, Atlanta, Georgia
April 2, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary F. Landers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was supported by a grant provided by the State of Ohio's State Superintendent's Task Force on Preparing Special Education Personnel.

EC 300627

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study, a survey of mainstream teachers, extened a 1987 study done by Rogus & Wiersma. The co-investigators sought to answer the following question: If there is a "core" of essential competencies as previously established by Rogus & Wiersma (1987) for all teachers of the severely handicapped, then to what extent are these same competencies necessary for teachers who have special education students mainstreamed into their classrooms? An answer to this question is seen as critical for addressing issues such as the Regular Education Initiative and inclusive schooling (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). Implications for teacher training are suggested.

The intent of this research was to build upon the knowledge base generated from Ohio special educators by Rogus & Weirsma (1987) with respect to competencies for instructing children with handicaps. The researchers sought to determine how similar to special education teachers or how different from special education teachers regular classroom teachers would respond to the "core competencies" determined in the Rogus & Weirsma study. There were three objectives of the study. These will be discussed following a description of the population, the survey instrument, and the data analysis.

Methodology

Population Sample

A list of one thousand randomly selected regular classroom teachers, grades K-12, was secured from the Ohio State Department of Education. All 1000 teachers were sent a survey during the fall of 1989. The return after the initial mailing and a follow-up mailing was two hundred and forty useable surveys (approximately 25%); of these, thirty-six surveys were removed because the respondents indicated that they held special education certification. The final number for the statistical analysis was two-hundred and four (204), which included two-hundred (200) regular classroom teachers and 4 respondents who did not indicate their teaching assignment.

The sample was representative of all teaching levels (Elementary 48.9%; Middle School 10.9%; Jr. High 12%: Secondary 28.3%) and all community types (City 26.8%; Rural 32.5%; Suburban 40.7%). The majority (77.5%) had taught more than ten years, while 12.3% had taught between six and ten years and 10.3% had taught five or less years. Ninety three (93) percent indicated that they had served as a teacher of a mainstreamed student. The handicapping conditions of the mainstreamed students were: SLD (54.5%), DH (18.2%), HH (9.1%), SBH (7.3%) VH (5.5%), OH (3.6%), and MH (1.8%).

Survey Instrument

The survey contained the sixty-five (65) core competencies (Rogus & Wiersma, 1987) determined to be common across all special education categories. The teachers were asked to respond to the core competencies in two ways. First, to indicate on a Likert scale (not important = 1 to most important = 5) how <u>important</u> each competency was for a mainstream teacher. Second, to respond (yes or no) to the question, "Do you <u>possess</u> the competency to any degree?"

Data Analysis

"Importance" Ratings

Means were computed for the sixty-five core competencies and the competencies were ranked from highest to lowest mean. This ranking of the mainstream teachers' perceptions of the "importance" of these competencies was then correlated with the ranking of the special education teachers' perceptions of these same competencies from the 1987 study. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient found a strong correlation (rho = .80) to exist between the two groups.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks and a Chi Square test were computed to determine if responses to the sixty-five core competencies varied by teaching level, community type and/or number of years teaching (see Table 1). An alpha .05 level was established. Forty-three or 66% of the items were found to be significant: twenty-two (22) by teaching level, eleven (11) by community type, nine (9) by level and community, and one (1) by years taught and community type.

A factor analysis (varimax rotation) identified nineteen items that formed six factor groups (see Table 2). The six factors identified were as follows: (1) Interactive Learning; (2) Learning Atmosphere; (3) Instructional Planning; (4) Curricular Adaptations; (5) Special Education Foundations; and (6) Classroom Management.

"Possess" Responses

Means were computed for each of the competencies responded to as "being possessed to some degree" or "not being possessed." The means were then ranked. This ranking of "possessing" the competency was correlated to the ranking of the "importance" of the competency using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. A very strong correlation (rho = .91) was found to exist between the two rankings done by the sample group of mainstream teachers.

Chi Square analysis showed that thirteen or 20% of the responses varied by teaching level (N = 5), by community type (N = 6), by level and community (N = 1), and by years taught (N = 1).

Objectives and Findings

Objective One: To survey regular classroom teachers to ascertain: (a) if these teachers value the same competencies for teaching the handicapped as do special educatorsand (b) if they view themselves as possessing these competencies to the same degree as do special educators.

Findings: Objective One Part (A)

The Spearman rank correlation (rho = .80) between the mainstream teacher sample and the 1987 special education teacher sample showed that both groups value similarly the sixty five core competencies when teaching special education students. The following sixteen items include the top ten ranked by mean rating for both groups (Special Ed Teachers = SPED; Mainstream Teachers = MS):

Competencies Ranked One to Ten
by
Special Education and Mainstream Teachers
with
Kruskal-Wallis Level of Significance

The teacher is able to:	Sped Rank	MS Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
57. foster a classroom atmosphere wherein students perceive themselves as free to admit not understanding.	05	01	-----
46. provide instruction in an accepting and caring environment.	13	02	-----
54. interact with students demonstrating highest respect for their persons.	07	03	COM .01

The teacher is able to:	Sped Rank	MS Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
40. provide learning activities which provide students' opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning, to use the decision-making process, and to express their thinking.	13	04	LEV .00
56. schedule the day's activities in a way that learners experience a sense of routine and consistent structure and are able to anticipate requirements and expectations.	15.5	05	LEV .00
31. design a learning environment which encourages active participation by learners in a variety of learning activities.	02	06	COM .04 LEV .02
55. arrange the physical environment so that the classroom is characterized by safety, comfort, convenience, and easy access to resources.	25	07	COM .00
53. serve as a model in interacting with students.	10	08	COM .00
58. carry out a program with consideration to providing opportunity for handicapped students to interact with non-handicapped students.	35.5	09	-----
30. design a learning environment which provides for feedback to learners.	08	10	COM .03
9. demonstrate understanding of the range of deviant classroom behaviors, including acting out, withdrawal, defensive, and disorganized behaviors.	01	11	-----
12. apply principles of sound conferencing in meeting with parents and other professionals.	03.5	13	LEV .01
7. apply alternative teaching strategies.	10	14	LEV .01
45. provide instruction in social and communication skills.	10	15	LEV .00

	The teacher is able to:	Sped Rank	MS Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
22.	recognize the implications of specific disabilities (motor, vision, hearing) for planning and assessment/evaluation procedures.	06	19	LEV .00
16.	develop IEPs working in consultation with team members.	03.5	48	LEV .01

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis with alpha level significance set at the .05 level was only done on the mainstream teacher data. Of the ten items with the highest mean rankings by the mainstream teachers, three (3) were found not to vary across teaching level, community type, or number of years taught. These three items dealt with instruction provided in a caring/accepting environment where students are free to admit not understanding and where handicapped/nonhandicapped student interaction is promoted. Five (5) items were found to vary by community type and three (3) varied by teaching level. In an attempt to understand where these variances occurred, the percent of responses receiving either a four or a five rating by each group was compiled. (Community Groups: City, Rural, and Suburb=Suburban; Teaching Level Groups: Elementary=Elem, Middle School=Middle, Jr High School= Jr High, and Secondary School=Secondary)

Percent of Responses Rated Four and Five
Grouped by
Community and Teaching Level

	COMMUNITIES			TEACHING LEVELS			
Item	City	Rural	Suburb	Elem	Middle	Jr High	Secondary
31	96.2	90.5	91.1	97.8	100	90.9	84.6
54	94.2	90.5	93.6	----	---	----	----
55	94.2	85.7	93.6	----	---	----	----
53	92.3	82.5	91.1	- - - -	- - -	----	----
30	90.4	82.5	91.1	- - - -	- - -	----	----
56	- - - -	- - - -	----	96.7	100	85.7	90.4
40	- - - -	- - - -	----	94.4	95.0	90.5	90.0

The response percentages indicate that the teachers in the rural communities tended to rate these items "less important" than the city or the suburban teacher respondents. The percentages by teaching level indicate that the elementary and middle school teachers tended to give "higher importance" ratings than did the junior high or secondary teachers.

Findings: Objective One Part (B)

The part of objective one concerning the possession of the competencies can only be addressed from the mainstream teachers' perspective. The special education teachers in the 1987 study were not asked to respond to a possession item.

Of the sixty-five core competencies, fifty-four had means less than 1.50 when "possess to some degree" = 1 and "do not possess" = 2 (see Table 3). The Spearman rank correlation (rho = .91) between the "importance" means and the "possession" means clearly indicated that if the

mainstream teachers perceived the competency as important, it was also perceived to be possessed to "some degree."

The Chi Square analysis of the mainstream teachers' perceptions of "possessing or not possessing" each competency found (at alpha level =.05 significance) that thirteen of the items varied across groups. On item 19, dealing with awareness of commercial curricula, the teaching group having 6 to 10 years of experience answered more negatively than did the teachers with more or less experience. On the seven items found to vary by community, the suburban group tended to see themselves as "possessing" the competency to a greater degree than did the city or rural populations. The rural populations indicated less competence on five of the items (#8, #13, #15, #51, and # 59) found to vary significantly across groups while the city population indicated less competence on two of the items (#34 and #45).

Rural. On only one of the items (#51, employing a variety of instructional groupings) did the total group rank it in the upper half. The item, implementing a criterion-referenced model of teaching (#59), was ranked in the lower thirty-seven percent by the total group. Items #8, #15, and #13 were ranked in the lower thirty-seven percent and related to transdisciplinary functioning and being familiar with special education literature.

City. The city population perceived themselves "less competent" on two items ranked in the upper thirty percent and dealing with supplementing curriculum (#34) and instruction in social and communication skills (#45).

There were six items found to vary significantly by teaching level. No teaching level group appeared to influence all of the items.

Elementary. On two items (#1 and #45) the elementary group answered more positively than the other three groups. Both of these items were ranked in the upper thirty-three percent by the total group.

Middle School. On one item (#53) the middle school group answered more negatively than the other three groups. This item was ranked second by the total group and dealt with serving as a model when interacting with students.

Secondary. The secondary group also responded as being less competent than did the other three groups on one item (#39). This item was ranked in the upper twenty-five percent by the total group and dealt with providing child-centered activities and having active learner involvement.

Elem/Jr High. On one item(#14) the elementary and junior high groups responded positively while the middle school and secondary groups responded more negatively. This item was ranked in the lower twelve percent by the total group and had to do with knowledge of special education agencies and organizations.

Elem/Middle. On one item (#42) the elementary and middle school populations responded more positively than did the junior high and secondary groups. This item was ranked in the upper twenty-five percent by the total group and dealt with utilizing small group instructional strategies.

Objective Two: To identify from the data analysis the needs of regular educators in teaching the handicapped (at both the preservice and inservice levels).

Needs at Preservice Level

The relationship of preservice education to this study is limited to the "importance" ratings (Table 1) given by inservice teachers and to the degree mainstreaming is occurring in the market where regular education preservice teachers are being employed. The incidence of regular classrooms serving the mainstreamed student was not a part of this study; each college or university will have to determine the likelihood of their graduates being employed and

needing competencies to serve mainstreamed students. However, the move nationally is toward more inclusive schooling (Stainback & Stainback, 1990).

The researchers agreed that, if teacher preparation programs are going to prepare their graduates to serve as mainstream teachers, then any item with an "importance" mean greater than 4.0 was worthy of attention. Thirty-two (32) or forty-nine percent of the "core competencies" met the 4.0 criterion. These competencies when organized by the Rogus & Wiersma categories (see Table 4) suggest placement for the competencies within a preservice teacher education program.

Needs at Inservice Level

The strong correlation (rho = .80) between the inservice special educator ratings and the inservice mainstream teacher ratings of the "importance" of the core competencies suggests a regular education/special education "shared subcore" of competencies within the core competencies. Both regular and special educators need to be aware of their mutual valuing of this "shared subcore". This subcore has the potential for bringing the mainstream teacher and the special educator together for collaboration and growth within the school setting. On the other hand, the competencies (Table 1) receiving the lowest "importance" ratings (mean less than 3.50) by the mainstream teachers seem to suggest those skills special educators need to address. However, two of the items (#49 & #7) that where ranked low in importance, may need to be addressed at the preservice level by both regular educator and special educator teacher trainers. If the concept of inclusive schooling (Stainbach & Stainbach, 1990) is to be achieved then teachers will have to be prepared to 'supervise and monitor paraprofessionals and volunteers,' as item 49 states. Item #7, knowledge of life span issues as they apply to handicapped individuals, may not seem as crucial to regular educators now, but as more mainstreaming occurs understanding the handicapped adults' potential functioning will be as important as understanding the non-handicapped adults' potential functioning and how that functioning relates to what is being taught in any subject at any level.

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis that found significant response differences between teachers at various teaching levels and within various geographic communities suggests that supervisors, inservice providers, and educational reformers need to tailor programming to the teaching level and/or community within which the teachers function. The extremely high importance rankings, even by those groups found to respond significantly different, suggest that all mainstream teachers have need to some degree for the most highly rated competencies and inservice providers need to explore the degree of that need.

The high correlation (rho = .91) between the mainstream teacher ratings of the "importance" of the core competencies and their responses to "possessing" the competency suggests that mainstream teachers are not blank slates. They have learned formally or through experience some of the skills identified by special educators as important when working with handicapped individuals. They feel that they possess the skills "to some degree." This understanding of "possessing the skill" may not be mutually agreed to by special educators (Furey & Strauch, 1983), but inservice providers and special educator collaborators need to be aware of the mainstream teachers perception of "possessing" the skill, if a positive relationship is to be struck. This perception can also be the point of departure for mutual collaboration.

The chi square analysis (Table 3) of "possessing" the competency showed no significant variation across mainstream teacher groups on 52 of the 65 items; thus the groups seem to be more similar than different in their perceptions of "possessing" these competencies to some degree. The group, however, which seemed to be most different and in need of the most training was the rural group.

Objective Three: To suggest preservice and inservice program implications.

Preservice Implications

1. Regular educators who are being prepared to work with mainstream students and special educators share certain training needs. Not all coursework need be separate.

2. Teachers Educators should consider the thirty-two competencies found in Table 4 when designing teacher preparation programs for regular educators who are being prepared to work with mainstream students.

3. The Rogus & Wiersma groupings (Table 4) can be used as a guide for placement of the thirty-two competencies within a teacher preparation program.

4. The concepts of life span issues and utilization of paraprofessionals needs to be addressed by teacher educators eventhough mainstream teachers do not presently see them as "important" when working with handicapped students.

Inservice Implications

1. Some inservice training needs of regular educators who serve mainstream students and special educators are probably the same.

2. Mainstream teachers perceive themselves as possessing some of the same competencies that special educators rate as important when working with handicapped children; role release should be encouraged.

3. Mainstream teachers and special educators share the "importance" of positive classroom environments where students can freely exchange thoughts and the handicapped/nonhandicapped interaction is promoted; collaboration should be fostered, formally and informally.

4. Educational reformers/innovators need to take into account such variables as community type and level of teaching when implementing new ideas.

5. Teachers with varying years of experience appear to hold many of the same attitudes toward their teaching needs when working with handicapped individuals; thus, youth and experience have a basis for working together in the education of handicapped individuals.

References

Rogus, J., & Wiersma, W. (Eds.) (1987). Teacher competency: Teaching the severely handicapped. Columbus OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.) (1990). Support networks for inclusive schooling. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

TABLE 1

"IMPORTANCE RATINGS" of COMPETENCIES
RANK/MEAN/STANDARD DEVIATION/KRUSKAL-WALLIS

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
57. foster a classroom atmosphere wherein students perceive themselves as free to admit not understanding.	01	4.68	0.62	- - -
46. provide instruction in an accepting and caring environment.	02	4.66	0.60	- - -
54. interact with students demonstrating highest respect for their persons.	03	4.62	0.74	COM .01
40. provide learning activities which provide students' opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning, to use the decision-making process, and to express their thinking.	04	4.59	0.70	LEV .00
56. schedule the day's activities in a way that learners experience a sense of routine and consistent structure and are able to anticipate requirements and expectations.	05	4.57	0.68	LEV .00
31. design a learning environment which encourages active participation by learners in a variety of learning activities.	06	4.54	0.72	COM .04 LEV .02
55. arrange the physical environment so that the classroom is characterized by safety, comfort, convenience, and easy access to resources.	07	4.53	0.71	COM .00
53. serve as a model in interacting with students.	08	4.51	0.77	COM .00

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
58. carry out a program with consideration to providing opportunity for handicapped students to interact with non-handicapped students.	09	4.49	0.73	- - -
30. design a learning environment which provides for feedback to learners.	10	4.48	0.72	COM .03
9. demonstrate understanding of the range of deviant classroom behaviors, including acting out, withdrawal, defensive, and disorganized behaviors.	11	4.45	0.75	- - -
48. apply management systems consistent with sound professional ethics.	12	4.43	0.72	COM .05 LEV .02
12. apply principles of sound conferencing in meeting with parents and other professionals.	13	4.41	0.85	LEV .01
37. apply alternative teaching strategies.	14	4.40	0.71	LEV .01
45. provide instruction in social and communication skills.	15	4.36	0.84	LEV .00
42. apply small group instructional strategies.	16	4.33	0.82	COM .01 LEV .00
39. arrange a variety of child-centered experiences which require active learner involvement.	17.5	4.30	0.85	COM .02 LEV .00
29. recognize the potential need for crisis prevention/intervention.	17.5	4.30	0.80	LEV .03
22. recognize the implications of specific disabilities (motor, vision, hearing) for planning and assessment/evaluation procedures.	19	4.29	0.85	COM .00
34. select and/or develop curriculum materials to supplement the standard curriculum.	20	4.28	0.80	COM .03 LEV .01

	The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
10.	demonstrate understanding that deviant behaviors most commonly occur in combination rather than in isolation.	21	4.27	0.82	LEV .01
47.	apply alternative reinforcement systems.	22	4.26	0.84	LEV .02
33.	plan different learning activities for auditory and visual-tactile-kinesthetic learners.	23.5	4.25	0.94	COM .02
41.	apply one-to-one instructional strategies.	23.5	4.25	0.87	LEV .01
11.	demonstrate command of personal stress management techniques.	25	4.24	0.89	---
61.	apply a variety of strategies (early intervention).	26	4.16	0.87	LEV .00
65.	match teaching approach to the temperment and motivational orientation of individual students.	27	4.15	0.93	COM .01
38.	employ multiple presentations in different modes to faciltiate generalization.	28	4.11	0.87	COM .04 LEV .02
44.	provide appropriate time and instruction in all academic areas.	29	4.10	1.02	LEV .00
23.	write instructional objectives that are measurable/observable.	30	4.02	1.02	---
52.	structure and manage transition time effectively.	31.5	4.01	0.98	LEV .00
64.	apply a variety of consutation techniques with parents, students, and others.	31.5	4.01	0.91	---
5.	demonstrate understanding of the principles of human development as they relate to the handicapped.	33	3.97	0.87	---
25.	sequence individual student learning objectives.	34	3.96	0.99	---

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
21. demonstrate ability to make the linkage among the processes of diagnostic assessment, learning activity selection, and progress evaluation.	35	3.95	0.94	LEV .03
4. demonstrate an understanding of family dynamics as they apply to handicapped individuals.	37.5	3.92	0.97	LEV .04
15. participate effectively as a member of a transdisciplinary team.	37.5	3.92	1.02	LEV .00
32. identify the primary modality used by learners to identify, code, and relate receptive information.	37.5	3.92	1.02	LEV .03
60. use technological aids to personalize instruction.	37.5	3.92	0.92	- - -
6. demonstrate understanding of the variety of program options available to the handicapped.	40	3.90	1.09	LEV .04
51. employ a variety of instructional groupings.	41	3.87	0.94	COM .04 LEV .00
18. demonstrate understanding of the concepts "scope and sequence" as applied to curriculum planning.	42	3.86	0.96	- - -
28. make changes in student programs based on systematic probes of student performance.	43	3.85	0.99	LEV .00
24. perform task analysis.	44	3.83	1.02	- - -
59. implement a criterion-referenced model of teaching.	45	3.74	1.05	COM .00
36. plan for use of paraprofessional personnel and volunteers.	46	3.71	0.99	COM .00 LEV .00
1. state a personal philosophy of special education.	47	3.70	1.09	YRS .03 LEV .02
16. develop IEPs working in consultation with team members.	48	3.69	1.20	LEV .01

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
27. generate instructional programs from systematic probes of student performance.	49	3.67	0.96	LEV .00
62. teach vocational and/or transition skills using a variety of techniques and strategies.	50	3.63	1.07	- - -
14. demonstrate awareness of agencies and professional organizations which function to facilitate the delivery of services to handicapped children/ youth.	51.5	3.61	1.11	LEV .01
26. demonstrate knowledge of the research on one-to-one and small group instructional strategies.	51.5	3.61	1.07	- - -
35. select/construct criterion-referenced assessment materials.	53	3.60	0.91	- - -
19. demonstrate awareness of the advantages and limitations of commercially available curricula.	54	3.57	0.88	- - -
20. explain the rationale for and objectives in providing supportive therapy services.	55.5	3.56	0.99	- - -
63. apply a variety of techniques and strategies when teaching leisure skills.	55.5	3.56	1.06	- - -
8. explain the importance of trans-disciplinary planning.	57	3.53	1.11	COM .01
2. demonstrate knowledge of legal issues relative to special education.	58	3.52	1.11	- - -
43. incorporate multi-disciplinary strategies, e.g., physical therapy, occupational therapy, in program implementation.	59	3.50	1.20	COM .01 LEV .01
50. employ a variety of organizational, data recording, and strategies.	60	3.46	1.00	LEV .04
49. supervise and monitor the performance of paraprofessional personnel and volunteers.	61	3.36	1.12	COM .01

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
17. demonstrate understanding of operant, developmental, and ecological perspectives as they apply to curriculum planning.	62	3.33	1.12	---
7. demonstrate knowledge of life span issues as they apply to handicapped individuals.	63	3.18	1.08	---
13. demonstrate familiarity with the major publications and journals in the field of exceptionality.	64	2.93	1.09	COM .04
3. demonstrate knowledge of the history of special education.	65	2.34	1.11	-----

TABLE 2

SIX FACTOR GROUPS OF "IMPORTANCE RATINGS"

FACTOR ONE - Interactive Learning

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
30. design a learning environment which provides for feedback to learners.	4.48	10	COM .03
31. design a learning environment which encourages active participation by learners in a variety of learning activities.	4.54	06	COM .04 LEV .02
39. arrange a variety of child-centered experiences which require active learner involvement.	4.30	17.5	COM .02 LEV .00

FACTOR TWO - Learning Atmosphere

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
54. interact with students demonstrating highest respect for their persons.	4.62	03	COM .01
55. arrange the physical environment so that the classroom is characterized by safety, comfort, convenience, and easy access to resources.	4.53	07	COM .00
56. schedule the day's activities in a way that learners experience a sense of routine and consistent structure and are able to anticipate requirements and expectations.	4.57	05	LEV .00
57. foster a classroom atmosphere wherein students perceive themselves as free to admit not understanding.	4.68	01	-----

FACTOR THREE- Instructional Planning

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
23. write instructional objectives that are measurable/observable.	4.02	30	-----
24. perform task analysis.	3.83	44	-----
25. sequence individual student learning objectives.	3.96	34	-----

FACTOR FOUR-Curricular Adaptations

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
60. use technological aids to personalize instruction.	3.92	37.5	-----
62. teach vocational and/or transition skills using a variety of techniques and strategies.	3.63	50	-----
63. apply a variety of techniques and strategies when teaching leisure skills.	3.56	55.5	-----

FACTOR FIVE-Special Education Foundations

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
2. demonstrate knowledge of legal issues relative to special education.	3.52	58	-----
3. demonstrate knowledge of the history of special education.	2.34	65	-----
5. demonstrate understanding of the principles of human development as they relate to the handicapped.	3.97	33	-----

FACTOR SIX-Classroom Management

The teacher is able to	Mean	Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)
50. employ a variety of organizational data recording, and strategies.	3.46	60	LEV .04
51. employ a variety of instructional groupings.	3.87	41	COM .04 LEV .00
52. structure and manage transition time effectively.	4.01	31.5	LEV .00

TABLE 3

"POSSESS COMPETENCY" RATINGS
RANK/MEAN/STANDARD DEVIATION/CHI SQUARE

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance ($\alpha = .05$)
57. foster a classroom atmosphere wherein students perceive themselves as free to admit not understanding.	02	1.03	0.18	---
54. interact with students demonstrating highest respect for their persons.	02	1.03	0.17	---
53. serve as a model in interacting with students.	02	1.03	0.18	LEV .04
55. arrange the physical environment so that the classroom is characterized by safety, comfort, convenience, and easy access to resources.	04	1.04	0.20	---
40. provide learning activities which provide students' opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning, to use the decision-making process, and to express their thinking.	05.5	1.05	0.22	---
56. schedule the day's activities in a way that learners experience a sense of routine and consistent structure and are able to anticipate requirements and expectations.	05.5	1.05	0.22	---
46. provide instruction in an accepting and caring environment.	07.5	1.06	0.25	---
31. design a learning environment which encourages active participation by learners in a variety of learning activities.	07.5	1.06	0.25	---
30. design a learning environment which provides for feedback to learners.	10.5	1.08	0.28	---
48. apply management systems consistent with sound professional ethics.	10.5	1.08	0.27	---

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance ($\alpha = .05$)
37. apply alternative teaching strategies.	10.5	1.08	0.27	---
42. apply small group instructional strategies.	10.5	1.08	0.27	LEV .02
23. write instructional objectives that are measurable/observable.	13	1.09	0.29	- - -
12. apply principles of sound conferencing in meeting with parents and other professionals.	14	1.10	0.30	- - -
58. carry out a program with consideration to providing opportunity for handicapped students to interact with non-handicapped students.	16	1.11	0.32	- - -
39. arrange a variety of child-centered experiences which require active learner involvement.	16	1.11	0.31	LEV .03
41. apply one-to-one instructional strategies.	16	1.11	0.31	- - -
45. provide instruction in social and communication skills.	18.5	1.12	0.32	COM .03 LEV .01
34. select and/or develop curriculum materials to supplement the standard curriculum.	18.5	1.12	0.33	COM .02
29. recognize the potential need fo crisis prevention/intervention.	21.5	1.13	0.34	- - -
47. apply alternative reinforcement systems.	21.5	1.13	0.34	- - -
65. match teaching approach to the temperment and motivational orientation of individual students.	21.5	1.13	0.34	---
1. state a personal philosophy of special education.	21.5	1.13	0.34	LEV .03
51. employ a variety of instructional groupings.	24	1.14	0.34	COM .04

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance (α=.05)
11. demonstrate command of personal stress management techniques.	26	1.15	0.36	---
61. apply a variety of strategie (early intervention).	26	1.15	0.36	---
18. demonstrate understanding of the concepts "scope and sequence" as applied to curriculum planning.	26	1.15	0.36	---
9. demonstrate understanding of the range of deviant classroom behaviors, including acting out, withdrawal, defensive, and disorganized behaviors.	28	1.16	0.37	---
38. employ multiple presentations in different modes to faciltiate generalization.	29.5	1.17	0.38	---
52. structure and manage transi tion time effectively.	29.5	1.17	0.38	---
10. demonstrate understanding that deviant behaviors most commonly occur in combination rather than in isolation.	31	1.19	0.40	---
64. apply a variety of consutation techniques with parents, students, and others.	32	1.20	0.40	---
60. use technological aids to personalize instruction.	33	1.21	0.41	---
22. recognize the implications of specific disabilities (motor, vision, hearing) for planning and assessment/evaluation procedures.	34.5	1.22	0.42	---
25. sequence individual student learning objectives.	34.5	1.22	0.41	---
33. plan different learning activities for auditory and visual-tactile-kinesthetic learners.	36	1.23	0.42	---
44. provide appropriate time and instruction in all academic areas.	37	1.26	0.44	---

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance (α=.05)
24. perform task analysis.	38	1.29	0.46	---
35. select/construct criterion-referenced assessment materials.	39	1.30	0.46	---
28. make changes in student programs based on systematic probes of student performance.	41	1.32	0.47	---
59. implement a criterion-referenced model of teaching.	41	1.32	0.47	COM .02
36. plan for use of paraprofessional personnel and volunteers.	41	1.32	0.47	---
19. demonstrate awareness of the advantages and limitations of commercially available curricula.	43	1.34	0.47	YRS .04
5. demonstrate understanding of the principles of human development as they relate to the handicapped.	44.5	1.35	0.48	---
4. demonstrate an understanding of family dynamics as they apply to handicapped individuals.	44.5	1.35	0.48	---
32. identify the primary modality used by learners to identify, code, and relate receptive information.	46	1.36	0.48	---
15. participate effectively as a member of a transdisciplinary team.	47.5	1.38	0.49	COM .02
50. employ a variety of organizational, data recording, and strategies.	47.5	1.38	0.49	---
21. demonstrate ability to make the linkage among the processes of diagnostic assessment, learning activity selection, and progress evaluation.	49	1.39	0.49	---
27. generate instructional programs from systematic probes of student performance.	50	1.40	0.49	---
6. demonstrate understanding of the variety of program options available to the handicapped.	52	1.41	0.49	---

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance ($\alpha = .05$)
26. demonstrate knowledge of the research on one-to-one and small group instructional strategies.	52	1.41	0.49	---
63. apply a variety of techniques and strategies when teaching leisure skills.	52	1.41	0.49	---
49. supervise and monitor the performance of paraprofessional personnel and volunteers.	54	1.44	0.50	---
16. develop IEPs working in consultation with team members.	55	1.50	0.50	---
62. teach vocational and/or transition skills using a variety of techniques and strategies.	56	1.53	0.50	---
14. demonstrate awareness of agencies and professional organizations which function to facilitate the delivery of services to handicapped children and youth.	57.5	1.54	0.50	LEV .04
8. explain the importance of trans-disciplinary planning.	57.5	1.54	0.50	COM .02
20. explain the rationale for and objectives in providing supportive therapy services.	59.5	1.55	0.50	---
17. demonstrate understanding of operant, developmental, and ecological perspectives as they apply to curriculum planning.	59.5	1.55	0.50	---
2. demonstrate knowledge of legal issues relative to special education.	61	1.60	0.49	---
7. demonstrate knowledge of life span issues as they apply to handicapped individuals.	62	1.71	0.45	---
43. incorporate multi-disciplinary strategies, e.g., physical therapy, occupational therapy, in program implementation.	63	1.72	0.45	---
3. demonstrate knowledge of the history of special education.	64	1.75	0.43	---

The teacher is able to	Rank	Mean	SD	Chi Square Significance (α=.05)
13. demonstrate familiarity with the major publications and journals in the field of exceptionality.	65	1.80	0.40	COM .03

TABLE 4

"IMPORTANCE" COMPETENCIES
WITH MEANS > 4.0
ORGANIZED BY Rogus & Wiersma GROUPS

A. FOUNDATIONS

	The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
9.	demonstrate understanding of the range of deviant classroom behaviors, including acting out, withdrawal, defensive, and disorganized behaviors.	---	11	4.45
12.	apply principles of sound conferencing in meeting with parents and other professionals.	LEV .01	13	4.41
10.	demonstrate understanding that deviant behaviors most commonly occur in combination rather than in isolation.	LEV .01	21	4.27
11.	demonstrate command of personal stress management techniques.	---	25	4.24

B. PLANNING AND EVALUATION

	The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
31.	design a learning environment which encourages active participation by learners in a variety of learning activities.	COM .04 LEV .02	06	4.54
30.	design a learning environment which provides for feedback to learners.	COM .03	10	4.48
29.	recognize the potential need for crisis prevention/intervention.	LEV .03	17.5	4.30
22.	recognize the implications of specific disabilities (motor, vision, hearing) for planning and assessment/evaluation procedures.	LEV .00	19	4.29

The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
34. select and/or develop curriculum materials to supplement the standard curriculum.	COM .03 LEV .03	20	4.28
33. plan different learning activities for auditory and visual-tactile-kinesthetic learners.	COM .02	23.5	4.25
23. write instructional objectives that are measurable/observable.	---	30	4.02

C. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
46. provide instruction in an accepting and caring environment.	---	02	4.66
40. provide learning activities which provide students' opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning, to use the decision-making process, and to express their thinking.	LEV .00	04	4.59
48. apply management systems consistent with sound professional ethics.	COM .05 LEV .02	12	4.43
37. apply alternative teaching strategies.	LEV .01	14	4.40
45. provide instruction in social and communication skills.	LEV .00	15	4.36
42. apply small group instructional strategies.	COM .01 LEV .00	16	4.33
39. arrange a variety of child-centered experiences which require active learner involvement.	COM .02 LEV .00	17.5	4.30
47. apply alternative reinforcement systems.	LEV .02	22	4.26
41. apply one-to-one instructional strategies.	LEV .01	23.5	4.25

The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
38. employ multiple presentations in different modes to faciltiate generalization.	COM .04 LEV .02	28	4.11
44. provide appropriate time and instruction in all academic areas.	LEV .00	29	4.10

D. CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND GROUP PROCESS

The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
57. foster a classroom atmosphere wherein students perceive themselves as free to admit not understanding.	---	01	4.68
54. interact with students demonstrating highest respect for their persons.	COM .01	03	4.62
56. schedule the day's activities in a way that learners experience a sense of routine and consistent structure and are able to anticipate requirements and expectations.	LEV .00	05	4.57
55. arrange the physical environment so that the classroom is characterized by safety, comfort, convenience, and easy access to resources.	COM .00	07	4.53
53. serve as a model in interacting with students.	COM .00	08	4.51
58. carry out a program with consideration to providing opportunity for handicapped students to interact with non-handicapped students.	---	09	4.49
52. structure and manage transition time effectively.	LEV .00	31.5	4.01

E. INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION

The teacher is able to	Kruskal-Wallis Significance (p=.05)	Rank	Mean
61. apply a variety of strategies (early intervention).	LEV .00	26	4.16
65. match teaching approach to the temperment and motivational orientation of individual students.	COM .01	27	4.15
64. apply a variety of consutation techniques with parents, students, and others.	-----	31.5	4.01